



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,495	04/25/2001	Ezhilan Narasimhan	SUN-P6114-MEG	9277

28422 7590 06/02/2005

HOYT A. FLEMING III
P.O. BOX 140678
BOISE, ID 83714

EXAMINER

JACOBS, LASHONDA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,495

Applicant(s)

NARASIMHAN ET AL.

Examiner

LaShonda T. Jacobs

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This is a Office Action in response to Applicants' RCE Amendment filed on March 7, 2005.

Claims 22-23 have been cancelled. Claims 1-21 have been amended. Claims 1-23 are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy et al (hereinafter "Hardy", U.S. Pat. No. 4,648,044) in view of de Judicibus (U.S. Patent No. 6,651,054).

As per claim 1, Hare discloses a method of generating a subroutine, method comprising:

- receiving a rule by the computer, the rule defining a premise and a conclusion to be drawn from the premise (col. 10, lines 12-20);
- transmitting the rule to a server (col. 7, lines 15-34);
- storing the rule on the server (col. 7, lines 15-34);
- generating a subroutine by the server that determines if the premise is true and, based at least in part upon the conclusion, outputting a first value if the premise is true and outputting a second value if the premise is false (col. 11, lines 40-67);

Art Unit: 2157

- receiving a parameter by the computer (col. 11, lines 47-53);
- transmitting the parameter to the server (col. 11, lines 47-53);
- determining, by the server, based at least in part upon the subroutine and the parameter, if the premise is true or if the premise is false (col. 11, lines 40-67); and
- transmitting the first value to the computer if the premise is true, otherwise transmitting the second value to the computer (col. 11, lines 40-46).

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- displaying a field for receiving a rule on a computer.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

- displaying a field for receiving a rule on a computer (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by including a display field to allow a user search a database/catalogue by defining parameters that fits the user criteria in order to received a result set from the user defined parameters in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 2, Hardy discloses the invention substantially as the claims discussed above.

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the act of receiving the rule includes receiving the rule by a browser running on the computer.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

Art Unit: 2157

- wherein the act of receiving the rule includes receiving the rule by a browser running on the computer (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by including a display field to allow a user search a database/catalogue by defining parameters that fits the user criteria in order to received a result set from the user defined parameters in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 3, Hardy discloses:

- wherein receiving the rule includes receiving a Java equation (col. 17, lines 13-20).

As per claim 4, Hardy discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the act of receiving a rule includes receiving a PL/SQL equation.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

- wherein the act of receiving a rule includes receiving a PL/SQL equation (col. 8, lines 59-67).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by specifying that the Basic language can be SQL since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claim 5, Hardy discloses:

- wherein the act of receiving the rule includes receiving a Basic equation (col. 17, lines 13-20).

As per claim 6, Hardy discloses:

Art Unit: 2157

- wherein the act of receiving the rule includes receiving a Virtual Basic equation (col. 17, lines 13-20).

As per claim 7, Hardy discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the act of transmitting the rule to the server includes transmitting the rule over the Internet.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

- wherein the act of transmitting the rule to the server includes transmitting the rule over the Internet (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by including the Internet to allow a user search a database/catalogue by defining parameters that fits the user criteria in order to received a result set from the user defined parameters in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 8, Hardy discloses:

- wherein the act of generating the subroutine includes generating a Java function (col. 17, lines 13-20).

As per claim 9, Hardy discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above:

- wherein the act of generating the subroutine includes generating a PL/SQL function.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

Art Unit: 2157

- wherein the act of generating the subroutine includes generating a PL/SQL function (col. 8, lines 59-67).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by specifying that the Basic language can be SQL since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claim 10, Hardy discloses:

- wherein the act of generating the subroutine includes generating a Basic function (col. 17, lines 13-20).

As per claim 11, Hardy further discloses:

- verifying that the subroutine is valid (col. 11, lines 34-46).

As per claim 12, Hardy discloses:

- wherein the act of verifying that the subroutine is valid includes running the subroutine through a syntax checker (col. 4, lines 18-22 and col. 11, lines 34-46).

As per claim 13, Hardy discloses:

- wherein the act of verifying that the subroutine is valid includes compiling the subroutine and determining if the function compiled without generating an error (col. 11, lines 34-46).

As per claim 14, Hardy discloses:

- wherein the act of verifying that the subroutine is valid includes compiling the subroutine, determining if compiling the subroutine generated an error, and if compiling the subroutine generated an error, then displaying a screen on the computer that allows editing of the rule (col. 11, lines 34-46).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 15, Hardy further discloses:

- displaying either the first value or the second value on the computer (col. 11, lines 40-67).

As per claim 16, Hardy discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the act of receiving the parameter includes receiving the parameter by a browser.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

- wherein the act of receiving the parameter includes receiving the parameter by a browser (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by including a display field to allow a user search a database/catalogue by defining parameters that fits the user criteria in order to received a result set from the user defined parameters in a timely and efficient manner.

As per claim 17, Hardy discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the act of transmitting the parameter to the server includes transmitting the parameter over the Internet.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

Art Unit: 2157

- wherein the act of transmitting the parameter to the server includes transmitting the parameter over the Internet (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by including the Internet to allow a user search a database/catalogue by defining parameters that fits the user criteria in order to received a result set from the user defined parameters in a timely and efficient manner

As per claim 18, Hardy discloses:

- wherein the method further includes executing the subroutine (col. 11, lines 40-67).

As per claim 19, Hardy discloses the invention substantially as claims discussed above.

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the act of transmitting the first value includes transmitting the first value over the Internet.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

- wherein the act of transmitting the first value includes transmitting the first value over the Internet (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by including the Internet to allow a user search a database/catalogue by defining parameters that fits the user criteria in order to received a result set from the user defined parameters in a timely and efficient manner

As per claim 20, Hardy discloses a program storage device containing instructions that when executed by a computer performs the following acts:

- the rule defining a premise and a conclusion to drawn if the premise is true (paragraphs 0026-0027);
- transmit the rule to a server (col. 7, lines 15-34); and
- display an assessment that is generated by a server based at least in part upon the premise and the parameter (col. 21, lines 17-41).

However, Hardy does not explicitly disclose:

- display a field for receiving a rule;
- displaying a field for receiving a parameter.

de Judicibus discloses a method, system and program for merging query search results comprising:

- display a field for receiving a rule (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5);
- displaying a field for receiving a parameter (see Figures 7 and 8, col. 7, lines 57-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of de Judicibus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hardy by including a display field to allow a user search a database/catalogue by defining parameters that fits the user criteria in order to received a result set from the user defined parameters in a timely and efficient manner.

- As per claim 21, Hardy discloses a program storage device containing instructions that when executed by a server performs the following acts:

Art Unit: 2157

- receive a rule from the computer defining a premise and a conclusion to be drawn if the premise is true from a remote electronic device (col. 10, lines 12-20); and
- generate a subroutine for determining if the premise is true or the premise is false and drawing a conclusion based at least upon whether the premise is true or the premise is false (col. 11, lines 40-67).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,560,592 to Reid et al

U.S. Pat. No. 6,604,141 to Ventura

U.S. Pat. No. 5,889,953 to Thebaut et al

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaShonda T. Jacobs whose telephone number is 571-272-4004. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M.-5:00 P.M..


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LaShonda T Jacobs
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

ltj
May 26, 2005


ABIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100